REMARKS

Claims 1-6, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected. Claims 1 and 3 are amended. Claims 2, 5 and 6 are cancelled..

Specification:

The Examiner has objected to the title and has offered a proposed amended title. Applicants have amended the title of the invention in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,486,871 (Marten '871) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,850 (Marten '850). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of at least claim 6, which has not been rejected on the basis of Marten '871 and Marten '850. Thus, this rejection is overcome.

Claims 1-6 are rejected, with claims 1, 3, and 4 being rejected in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,486,871 (Marten '871) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,850 (Marten '850) and official notice of grounded low pass filters. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, as to claims 2, 5 and 6, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

Amended Claims 1 and 3

With regard to the rejection of the independent claims, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 6, while claim 3 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6. Claims 1 and 3 now specifically set forth the existence of three low pass filters, coupled in a particular arrangement and operative under expressly specified conditions to achieve specific results.

The Examiner admits that neither of Marten '871 or Marten '850 teaches the limitations of claims 2, 5 or 6.

Filter Limitations are not Taught

As to claims 2 and 5, the Examiner admits that there is no teaching of a circuit for ac-grounding an output side of the switching circuit for predetermined time upon switchover of the switching circuit that comprises a first low pass filter made up of a resistor and a capacitor, connected between the output side of the first switching circuit and the ground. However, the Examiner takes official notice "that the use of grounded low pass filters that comprise a resistor and capacitor is well known in the art of electronics. Such low pass filters are commonly used to reduce noise and to limit bandwidth, and can generally be found in typical electronics textbooks."

As to claims 6/2 and 6/5, the Examiner admits that "neither Marten '871 nor Marten '850 explicitly teach a second low pass filter for removing low frequency noises of the output signal of the first amplifier, and a third low pass filter for removing low frequency noises of the output signal of the second amplifier, wherein an upper cut-off frequency of the first low pass filter is set lower than respective upper cut-off frequencies of the second and third low pass filters." The Examiner again takes "official notice" that low-pass filters are well known in the art and asserts that adding them would be routine and obvious.

Claims 1 and 3 now require three low pass filters. Official notice as to the function of a low pass filter does NOT render the existence of three low pass filters in a circuit obvious.

Claims 1 and 3 now specify the arrangement of the low pass filters, and their placement in specific locations of the circuit. Official notice as to the function of a low pass filter does NOT render their placement in a circuit obvious.

Claims 1 and 3 now specify the function of the low pass filters as connected in the circuit, specifically with respect to their cut off frequencies. Specifically, the claims now recite that "an upper cut-off frequency of the first low pass filter is set lower than respective upper cut-off frequencies of the second and third low pass filters."

Official notice as to this specific arrangement and function is not proper. The expressly specified arrangement provides a unique enhancement in the function for (1) removal of the low frequency noise and (2) enhancement in the responsiveness of switch-over (3) both concurrently realized. There is no teaching or suggestion of such result or function in the prior art, and to

suggest that it would be obvious necessarily requires a teaching of the problem. No such teaching has been provided by the Examiner.

Finally, pursuant to MPEP 2144.03, Section C, Applicants respectfully submit that they have demonstrated that the circuit as defined in claims 1 and 3, including the three low pass filters designed and arranged in the specific manner claimed, has unique features not found in the prior art. Thus, the Examiner's reliance on Official Notice is traversed, and Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner must either identify prior art that teaches the claimed circuit or allow the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

_____

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 29, 2009